DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 283 080 CG 019 969

AUTHOR Embree, Robert A.
TITLE Pro-Recreational Sex Morality, Religiosity, and Causal Attribution of Homosexual Attitudes.
PUB DATE Aug 86
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (94th, Washington, DC, August 22-26, 1986). Dot matrix print.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bias; College Students; Higher Education; *Homosexuality; Moral Issues; *Negative Attitudes; *Religious Factors; Sexuality; *Student Attitudes; *Value Judgment

ABSTRACT

Homosexual cognitive victimization is a term which emphasizes social evaluation of sexual behaviors judged in terms of sexual preference. Individual differences in cognitive victimization of homosexuals were examined in two studies. In the first study, undergraduate students (N=78) completed Likert-type rating scales measuring homosexual cognitive victimization and three causal attributions of the victimization position: (1) conventional attribution; (2) sexual freedom attribution; and (3) homosexual stress. Subjects also completed the Religious Association Scale and the Sexual Morality Scale. The results suggest that homosexual cognitive victimization is associated with an expressive rather than repressive view of sexuality. It appeared that tolerance of homosexuality was associated with lack of general Judeo-Christian religiosity and greater tolerance toward recreational sex. In the second study, undergraduate students (N=34) completed a shortened version of the Sexual Morality Scale, a measure of authoritarian religion, the homosexual cognitive victimization scale from the first study, the Revised Mosher Guilt Inventory, and a revised Sexual Attitude Scale. The results suggest that the role of religion is developing and maintaining negative attitudes toward homosexuality is complex. The findings support the seven moral types model. The moral types model, in combination with factor analysis, shows promise for sorting out influences at work in accepting or rejecting the notion of prejudice against homosexuals. Six pages of references and 14 data tables are included. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED283080

PRO-RECREATIONAL SEX MORALITY, RELIGIOSITY, AND CAUSAL ATTRIBUTION OF HOMOSEXUAL ATTITUDES

Robert A. Embree

CG 019969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert A. Embree

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 94th, Washington, DC, August 22-26, 1986.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Pro-Recreational Sex Morality, Religiosity, and Causal Attribution of Homosexual Attitudes

Robert A. Embree, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
Westmar College
Le Mars, Iowa 51031
Phone (712) 546-7081

Presented at 94th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association at Washington, D.C.

In 1885, private homosexual behavior between two adults became a criminal act in Great Britain. That law remained in effect until 1967 (Smith, 1986). In 1964, the Wolfenden Report (Sadoff, 1976) recommended a similar decriminalizing of consenting adult homosexual acts in the United States. Today changes in sodomy laws have resulted in the emancipation of homosexuals in some states (Haeberle, 1978). Marmor (1972) argued that exclusive homosexuality is no more unusual than exclusive heterosexuality; therefore, there is no justification to regard one deviant and the other normal. In 1973, the American Psychiatric Association Board virtually eliminated homosexuality as a diagnostic category; however, debate continues over the interpretation of that decision (Schacht, 1985; Spitzer, 1985). Along with this paradigm shift, psychology texts have been presenting more accurate and sympathetic treatments of homosexuality since the mid-1970's (Weitz, 1982). Newton (1979), while discovering hidden biases and factual errors in health science and sex education publications, did find that most writers expressed tolerance toward homosexuality. Consequently, concern about the causes of prejudice against homosexuality has replaced investigation of the causes and treatment of homosexuality (Bobys & Laner, 1979; Glassner & Owen, 1976; Millham, Miguel & Kellogg, 1976; MacDonald, Huggins, Young & Swanson, 1973; Mosher & O'Grady, 1979; Smith, 1971; Turnbull & Brown, 1977).

Just as changes in the concept of mental illness, can impact on how the mentally ill are treated (Farina, Fisher, Getter, and Fischer, 1978), so ought changes in professional views about homosexuality affect how homosexuals and heterosexuals are regarded in society. One important consequence has been a growing awareness that negative attitudes toward homosexuality constitute prejudice not unlike that of sexism and racism. Sensitization about the societal and personal problem is enhanced by the term "homophobia". While the term has several different meanings, homophobia, has come to mean unjustified negative reactions to those with a homosexual sexual preference (De Cecco, 1984; Fyfe, 1983). Herek (1984) has proposed three ways of understanding homophobia: 1) as a set of attitudes resulting from negative interactions with homosexuals (experiental), 2) as a mechanism for coping with inner conflict (defensive), or 3) as a by-product of sexual ideological socialization (symbolic attitudes).

The variable of central interest in my two studies was "homosexual cognitive victimization" defined by disagreement with the statement: "Treating sexual behavior between two consenting adults of the same sex as criminal, immoral, sexual deviancy, or mental illness is

prejudicial, discriminatory, and unjustified victimization of a minority group." The research objective was to explain the individual differences in cognitive victimization of homosexuals. This variable is similar to "homosexual bias" (Fyfe, 1983), "symbolic attitudes" (Herek, 1984), and "homosexism" (Hansen, 1982). The phrase, "homosexual cognitive victimization" emphasizes social evaluation of sexual behaviors judged in terms of sexual preference. When the phrase is used, I will always be making reference to the specific statement noted above. In my research, I have focused on causal attribution (Kelley and Michela, 1980) of homosexual cognitive victimization and moral evaluation of homosexuality. In addition I emphasized religiosity since involvement in religion, religiosity, and religious conservatism tend to be related to negative attitudes toward homosexuality (Herek, 1984).

Study 1

Method

Subjects and Procedures. Data were obtained from undergraduate volunteers (41 females and 37 males). Religious preferences were Protestant (62.2%), Roman Catholic (24%), none (12.8%), and atheist (1%). The average ages of the females and males, respectively, were 21.8 and 21.2 years. Seven variables were intercorrelated and factored using the method of principal components (Belanger, 1982).

Materials. Likert-type rating procedures were used to measure homosexual cognitive victimization and three causal attributions of the victimization position: "conventional attribution", "sexual freedom attribution", and "homosexual stress". A single item "homosexual arousal" scale was also included. All of these scale items were scored 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree). One of the items on "conventional attribution" scale was unreliable and was dropped. The split-half reliability estimate for the remaining three items was .86. The split- half estimated reliability for the "sexual freedom attribution" scale was .76. The estimated reliability for "homosexual stress" was a low .54. The scale items are listed on Table 1.

Insert Table 1 about here

The Religious Association Scale (RAS) (Embree, 1970, 1973) applies the "abilities" approach to the measurement of personality (Wallace, 1966, 1967). The RAS format is similar to The Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank (Rotter and Rafferty, 1950). But instead of word stimuli, twelve CVC-trigrams (TYM, MIZ, NUW, WUN, TOR, WIK, LOF, LAS, LOH, BEY, PYL, and ROZ) were used. The instructions were to think of a word associated with religion (biblical character, place, idea, church or church teaching) and to use the word in a complete

sentence. In the current application each sentence was scored as one or zero (no religious content). Data from undergraduate students (61 males and 78 females), tested in 1975 on a 25-item version of RAS, yielded a KR 20 reliability estimation of .83 for males and .88 for females for the twelve CVC-trigrams. Since males had a mean of 5.80 and females a mean of 8.06, these data, along with the respective standard deviations (3.53 and 3.71), were used to convert raw scores to stanine scores in the current study. The stanine score was used to define religiosity.

The Sexual Morality Scale (Embree, 1983, 1985) consists of twenty-four (24) phrases which can be assigned a moral judgment depending upon the nature of the consenting adult relationship. For this sample, the rating choices were immoral and improper (scored 3), immoral by some standards (scored 2), amoral (not a moral issue) (scored 0), moral if a moral question is raised (scored 1), and moral and proper (scored 0). The twenty-four (24) items were first rated for the heterosexual relationship followed by a rating of the homosexual relationship. However, only items 3 to 10, 12, 14 and 16) were actually scored. Both amoral and moral responses were scored zero. The estimated split-half reliability for the heterosexual relationship was .90 and .94 for the homosexual relationship. The "recreational sex" variable was defined by both ratings as follows: 1) raw scores from the two ratings were summed, 2) means and standard deviations were computed, and 3) stanine scores were computed. Pro-recreational sex is thus indicated by a low stanine score and anti-recreational sex by a high stanine score. The recreational sex theme can be seen in the eleven phrases used to define the scale: sharing nudity together, reading an erotic book with a partner, having oral-genital sex, taking a bath together, manually manipulating a partner's genitals, looking at each other's genitals, watching a sexually explicit movie together, sleeping in the nude together, attaching importance to sexual fulfillment, fantasizing having a different sexual partner, and trying out new ways to have sex.

Results

The intercorrelations of the variables and scale items are displayed on Table 2. These intercorrelations produced a single principal component factor which is shown on Table 3. The intercorrelations of the scales and the single factor are shown on

---

Insert Tables 2 and 3 about here

Tables 4 and 5. The single bipolar factor suggests that the homosexual cognitive victimization is associated with an expressive rather than repressive view of sexuality (Starbuck, 1981). That is, those who attribute a negative attitude toward homosexuality to conventional religious socialization tend to be more religious and to

be less accepting of recreational sex. Overall, the bipolar factor suggests tolerance of homosexuality is associated with lack of general Judeo-Christian religiosity and greater tolerance toward recreational sex.

Insert Tables 4 and 5 about here

Study 2

Vern L. Bullough (1976) has hypothesized that hostility toward homosexuality is rooted in the tradition of the West which has tended to be hostile toward sexual pleasure in general. Donald J. Cantor (1973) has proposed that attitude changes toward homosexuality are linked with reappraisals of all attitudes toward sex. Churchill (1967) believes efforts to suppress homosexuality are associated with a sex-negative culture. The single bipolar factor obtained from the variables employed in the first study is supportive of the thesis that a sex-negative culture generates negative attitudes toward homosexuality. The second study explored that hypothesis by including measures of sex guilt and attitudes toward sexuality.

Method

Subjects and Procedures. Twelve (12) female and 22 male undergraduate volunteers between 18 and 25 years of age participated in the second study. The mean age average for the females was 20.2 years and the average age for the males was 19.9 years. The religious preferences were Protestant (61.8%), Roman Catholic (26.4%) and none (11.8%). Three factor analyses were run with the first variable in each case one of the moral types subscales discussed below. In each case the intercorrelations were factored using the method of principal components (Belanger, 1982). Both the varimax simple structure and the oblique simple structure are reported. All correlations with authoritarian religion type are point-biserial coefficients. Only three of the seven sexual morality viewpoints discussed below were included in the factor analysis because subjects tended to score low on those four subscales.

Materials. The Sexual Morality Scale was reduced to sixteen (16) items with the odd items as fillers and only the even items actually scored. Subjects were instructed to first assign one of six moral categories to each of the items. The categories were: 1) Type A - acceptable only for married heterosexuals, 2) Type B - acceptable for all heterosexuals but not for homosexuals, 3) Type C - acceptable for all heterosexuals and homosexuals, 4) Type D - acceptable for homosexuals but not for heterosexuals, 5) Type E - not acceptable for heterosexuals nor homosexuals, 6) Type F - not a moral issue in any relationship (a personal decision), and 7) Type G - undecided (none of

the above describe my personal opinion). The subjects were directed to assign a number between 1 and 10 to each item after the moral evaluation had been completed. Number 1 indicated the opinion was "not strong and could be different tomorrow." Five was to be used if "you are not likely to change your opinion on this behavior." A rating of 10 meant that "your opinion is very strong and is not likely to change." Each category was then scored as an average of the weighted ratings. Thus 10 was the maximum average score for each moral type. This forced-choice technique yielded seven different average scores termed moral types. That is, for example, if a behavior were assigned to moral Type A, then all other moral types would automatically be scored zero for that item.

Although the RAS method was used, authoritarian religion rather than general religiosity was measured. Fromm's (1950) distinction between authoritarian and humanistic religion was employed in the instructions and scoring. As was the case in the first study, subjects were instructed to pronounce the CVC-trigrams and make a word association. But in this application, the sentence was to express a personal religious belief or personal philosophy. The critical part of the instructions was: "Each of us is religious in the sense that we have beliefs that give meaning and purpose to our lives. For some those beliefs emphasize obedience to a higher power. For others those beliefs stress the development and exercise of human powers." Using Fromm's criteria, each sentence was scored in two ways. In the normative scoring, a value of 2 was assigned if the sentence strongly suggested authoritarian religion. A value of 1 was assigned if authoritarianism were implied more than humanistic religion. The normative authoritarian religion score was a mean average of the total score divided by the number of sentences completed. In type scoring, all subjects with non-zero scores were defined as authoritarian religion types. One subject did not complete any sentences, but was defined as authoritarian based on the religious preference given. The ten CVC-trigrams were SOR, WIK, LIB, SEK, PYR, MER, FOL, BEY, LUF, and LOR. ROZ and the association "arose" were used to illustrate the two types of response options. The two examples were: 1) "My hope is in God's power to raise Jesus from the dead" (authoritarian) and 2) "We must take advantage of all opportunities when they arise" (humanistic).

As was the case in the first study, homosexual cognitive victimization was the criterion variable. It will be recalled that a low score on this single item scale is interpreted as homosexual cognitive victimization. The conventional causal attribution items are listed on Table 6. The score for conventional causal attribution scale was a mean average of the Likert-type ratings of those six items. The objective was to determine to what extent homosexual cognitive victimization was attributed to conventional socialization. Homosexual arousal was the following single item: "As an adult, I have fantasized about having sex or have been sexually attracted to a person of my own sex." The range for the single item score was from 1 to 5.

The Revised Mosher Guilt Inventory (Mosher, 1986) was used to

measure Sex-Guilt, Hostility-Guilt, and Guilty-Conscience. Each scale score was an average of item ratings (maximum 6 and minimum 0). Hendrick and Hendrick's revised Sexual Attitude Scale (1986) was used to measure Permissiveness, Sexual Practices, Communion, and Instrumentality. The range for the average ratings for these scales is from 1 to 5.

Results

The intercorrelations for the twelve variables for this small convenience sample of 34 is reported on Table 7. Because of the forced-choice nature of the moral types scores, three separate factor analyses were run. The varimax and oblique simple structures are reported on Tables 8-13. The main interest was in the comparison of the oblique simple structures for the three different moral positions. The results show similarities and differences in the variables loading significantly on the three factors obtained in each of the separate computations. For moral Type A, the pattern was rejection of the homosexual victimization statement, conventional causal

---

Insert Tables 7-13 about here

---

attribution of that rejection, low self report of homosexual arousal, and to be scripted (Simon and Gagnon, 1986) with Guilty-Conscience (See Table 9). However, the structure for moral Type B was characterized by Permissiveness, Instrumentality, and low scripting for Hostility-Guilt (See Table 11). For moral Type C , the factor structure was defined by acceptance of the victimization thesis, low conventional causal attribution, reporting homosexual arousal, and low scripted Guilty-Conscience (See Table 13). Of particular interest is the absence of authoritarian religion from each of the factors and authoritarian religion association with the same variables for all three comparisons. This common factor structure was characterized by low Sex-Guilt, high Sexual Practices, and high Communion. The three factors for each orthogonal analysis explained from 74.2% to 75.0% of the common factor variance. As shown on Table 14, authoritarian religion type correlated .56 with the normative scoring of authoritarian religion. While the pattern of the relationships with the variables employed in the study are similar, the strength of the relationships is not the same. Although no test for significant

---

Insert Table 14 about here

---

differences was run, the authoritarian type scoring method tended to generate higher relationships with the other variables than was the case for the normative scoring method.

General Discussion

The ideology of the "new morality" is that sex is all right even if its purpose is recreational. With the acceptance of this view, a number of the traditional moral standards no longer make sense (Haeberle, 1978; Starbuck, 1981). One change ought to be a more tolerate attitude toward homosexual relationships. An indication of change in sexual standards is suggested by the response to homosexual cognitive victimization. For the combined sample of 112, 44.6% strongly disagree or disagree that it is victimizing to regard homosexulity as an illness, as immoral, or criminal. By contrast, 35.7% strongly agree or agree that it is. These findings are not dissimilar to the attitudes of college freshmen enrolled in church-related four-year colleges. About the same percent strongly agree or somewhat agree that homosexual relations should be prohibited (Fact-file, 1985). As is hypothesized by the traditional/new morality distinction, low acceptance of recreational sex correlated positively +.51 to +.54 with all but one conventional causal attribution item (See Table 2).

John Money (1982) coined the term "sexosophy" to distinguish traditions about sexual conduct from "sexology", the science of sex. Herek (1984) theorizes that homophobia based on "symbolic attitudes" is derived from socialization. Scripting (Simon and Gagnon, 1986) is one way to explain this socialization and its effects. Traditional Judeo-Christian thought looked to medical science for support of its sexosophy in the 18th century. By the 19th century, the medical concept of deviancy supported the view that all non-procreative sex acts are pathological (Bullough, 1974). Sexual Desire (Scruton, 1986) is a recent addition to the defenders of traditional sexual morality. It has been hypothesized that religious and moral objections account for one main source of contemporary negative attitudes toward homosexuality (Fyfe, 1983). My first study yielded a single factor accounting for 69.0% of the variance (See Table 5). The bipolar factor is consistent with the pro-recreational vs. pro-natal sexosophy. Religiosity, as measured by the Religious Association Scale, loaded +.469 on that factor. This general religiosity correlated negatively (-.38) with the attitude that it is victimizing to treat sexual behavior between two consenting adults of the same sex as criminal, immoral, sexual deviancy, or mental illness. Religiosity correlated +.32 with causal attribution consistent with traditional religious socialization and -.30 with causal attribution consistent with the "new morality." The results from the first study are consistent with other work which has that shown negative attitudes toward homosexuality are associated with more frequent church attendance, religiosity, and conservative religiosity (Hellman, Green, Gray, and Williams, 1981; Henley and Pincus, 1978; Larsen, Reed, and Hoffman, 1980; Nevid, 1983).

However, the results from the second study suggest that the role of religion in developing and maintaining negative attitudes toward homosexuality is complex. The authoritarian type loaded significantly with Sex-Guilt, Sexual Practices, and Communion for all three

computations as shown in the oblique simple structures (See Tables 9, 11, and 13). Homosexual cognitive victimization did not load with this factor. Authoritarian religion type was found to correlate with Sex-Guilt +.43, Sexual Practices -.42, and Communion -.15. Thus the two sexual attitude scales suggest a sexual conservatism yet positive attitude toward sexuality. However, the varimax simple structure shows authoritarian religion type loading significantly on two factors, one of which includes homosexual cognitive victimization for Types A and C but not Type B (See Tables 8, 10, and 12). Authoritarian religion type correlated +.11 with Type A, +.27 with Type B, and -.47 with Type C. Homosexual cognitive victimization correlated -.26 with normative authoritarian religion and -.23 with authoritarian type religion. Conventional causal attribution correlated +.25 with normative authoritarian religion and .44 with authoritarian religion type. Type C subjects tended not to be authoritarian religiously speaking. Thus the religious scripting for Type C subjects would appear to be different in contrast to Type A and Type B subjects. It will be noted that 82.4% of the subjects were categorized as authoritarian types with the two methods of scoring authoritarian religion correlating +.57.

Sex guilt has been proposed as an explanation of negative attitudes toward homosexuality ("Christian Understanding", 1979-80). The current studies do not support the hypothesis that reduction in sex guilt will also result in a more tolerant attitude toward homosexuality. The correlation of Sex-Guilt with the victimization position was only +.05. An alternate interpretation is, that for this sample, lower Sex-Quilt has already resulted in a more tolerant attitude toward homosexuality. As shown on Table 7, the Sex-Guilt for this small sample was consistently low. Likewise, there was a low negative correlation (-.19) of the victimization with recreational sex (See Table 4).

The preliminary results obtained from the second study support the seven moral types model. Type A tends to be associated with rejecting homosexual cognitive victimization (r=-.31) and Type C with its acceptance (r=+.28). Type B correlated a low -.10 with the victimization statement. Type A subjects tend to justify the rejectance of victimization by conventional socialization (r=+.49) as do Type B subjects (r=+.22). But Type C subjects do attribute their views on victimization to conventional socialization (r=-.52). Not reporting sexual attraction to one's own sex is most characteristic of Type B subjects (r=-.31). Failure to report having experienced sexual arousal to one's own sex suggests homosexual threat (Leitner and Cado, 1982). Two bits of data would support this interpretation. Type A subjects tend to be scripted with Sex-Guilt (r=+.47). Type B subjects are not scripted with Sex-Guilt (r=-.35) nor are Type C subjects (r=-.22). Type A subjects are not very sexually Permissive (r=-.34). Neither are Type C subjects (r=+.12). However, Type B subjects tend to be more sexually permissive (r=+.21). Type A subjects tend not be Instrumental, that is, treat sex as a natural and pleasurable body function (r=-.19). Type B subjects tend to be Instrumental (r=+.19). Type C is not correlated with instrumentality (r=-.04). Type A

subjects tend to be scripted with Guilty-Conscience (r=+11). Type C subjects tend to lack Guilty-Conscience scripting (r=-.15). Guilty-Conscience scripting is unrelated with Type B morality (r=.00).

This comparision of the differences in relationships and factor structure suggests Type B subjects are likely to be the most stressed by societal acceptance of homosexuality as an alternate life style. Thus the low homosexual arousal of Type B subjects may be viewed as a defense mechanism, a defense which is not needed by either Type A nor Type C subjects. Our society scripts us to believe one is either homosexual or heterosexual. As a consequence, homosexual feelings may be repressed and be converted into an unconscious fear or possibly hatred of gays and lesbians. The defense of those repressed homosexual feelings is strong opposition to homosexuality. The hostility is thus outward rather than inward directed (Gramick, 1982). In the main, then, Type B subjects fit the profile of the homosexually stressed individual (Lietner and Cado, 1982) who feels the possibility of a sexual preference change. Confusion and even denial of homosexual arousal is just what would be expected of persons in the first stages of developing a gay or lesbian identity (Berger, 1983; Lewis, 1984).

Given the profile discussed above, Type B subjects are more prone than Type A subjects to experience the issues of homosexuality as more personally meaningful. The current data suggest that the moral types model may be useful as a tool for exploring why repression of homosexual attraction is functional for some but not for other adults. The inference, then, is that those with a belief system which sorts into categories like homosexuals and heterosexuals, with denied attraction to one's own sex, are strong candidates for homophobia (irrational fear of homosexuality).

But why aren't Type A subjects likely to be homophobic? The data suggest that those subjects are better candidates for fear of sex in general as shown by the tendency to have Sex-Guilt and low Permissiveness. Such a conclusion is consistent with Young and Whertvine's (1982) observation that students with positive attitudes toward sexual behavior tend to be less negative in attitudes toward homosexuality. On the otherhand, given the scripting of the Type C subjects, homophobia would appear to be less likely for this group. Type C subjects reject the traditional view that it is all right to stigmatize homosexuality. Future research might show that this group, in contrast to Types A and B, also has a more accurate picture of homosexuality, hence less need to be homophobic (Martin, 1982). Further research is needed to confirm the validity of these interpretations. In addition, the moral types might be useful in exploring Mosher and O'Grady's (1979) view that homosexual threat is different from fear of homosexuals and homosexual panic.

Western society has a long history of negative attitudes toward homosexuality (Bullough, 1976; Fyfe, 1983; Greenberg and Bystryn, 1982; Nelson, 1978). Reis (1981) has identified two broad ideologies about human sexuality, namely, "traditional-romantic" and "modern-

naturalistic". The modern-naturalistic ideology creates a greater climate of acceptance for homosexuality than does the traditional-romantic. However, Scruton (1986) is quite critical of morality derived from a scientific treatment of sexuality. Whether sexual morality emerges with moral development or socialization (Gibbs and Schnell, 1985) cannot be determined here. However, religious and philosophical tradition no doubt has played a significant role in creating and maintaining homophobia. Yet it is unlikely that these alone explain modern homophobia. Many definitions and explanations of homophobia have been advanced during the past two decades (Fyfe, 1983; Herek, 1983). Given the diversity of theories and the persisting tradition to segregate adults in society by sexual preference, it is likely that the causes of negative attitudes toward homosexuality are multidimensional (Hong, 1983; Millham, Miguel, and Kellogg, 1976).

Fyfe (1983) has made a distinction between homophobia as a clincial problem affecting individuals and homosexual bias as a problem of society. Yet in the past decades sexual choice has expanded in many areas. Given the personal autonomy enjoyed widely within society, those choices are likely to continue (Reis, 1982). However, as the reader is well aware, something such as AIDS (Batchelor, 1984) may provide the catalyst to swing the pendulum back to greater intolerance of the homosexual. Such swings in society have been noted by John Money (1980). It is not the task of science to determine sexual policy (Robinson, 1984; Reese and Fremouw, 1984) but social policy makers have a responsibility to be open to the findings of science (Mosher, 1986).

The study of morality, from a psychological perspective, presents numerous problems for theory and methodology (Blasi, 1980; Hogan, 1973; Kelley, 1971; Fittel and Mendelsohn, 1966). Sexual morality may reflect more the larger social community than a particular religious reference group (Middleton and Putney, 1962). However, the moral type model shows promises as a tool for exploring moral evaluations of sexuality and its correlates. The results reported here must be treated with caution since a different population and a larger sample might yield different data. Yet, the moral types, in combination with factor analysis, show promise for sorting out influences at work in accepting or rejecting the notion of prejudice against homosexuals. Since D'Augelli and Cross (1975) have shown that law and order moral reasoning is associated with less sex experience and more sex guilt, it would be interesting to explore the possibility that moral types are functioning at different levels of moral reasoning. In addition future research might explore the possibility that moral types and homosexual cognitive victimization can be differentiated in terms of sex role ambiguity (Krulewitz and Nash, 1980).

References

Batchelor, W. F. (1984). AIDS: A public health and psychological emergency. American Psychologist, 39, 1279-1284.

Belanger, R. R. (1982). Factor analysis Apple. Azusa, California: Belanger Research Associates.

Berger, R. M. (1983). What is a homosexual? A definitional model. Social Work, 28, 132-135.

Blasi, A. (1980). Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review: Psychological Bulletin, 88, 1-45.

Bobys, R. S., and Laner, M. R. (1979). On the stability of stigmatization: The case of ex-homosexual males. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 8, 247-261.

Bullough, Vern L. (1974). Homosexuality and the medical model. Journal of Homosexuality, 1, 99-110. (From Psychological Abstracts, 1975, 54, Abstract No. 1339).

Bullough, Vern L. (1976). Sexual variance in society and religion. New York: John Wiley.

Cantor, Donald J. (1973). The homosexual revolution. In P. F. Fink (Ed.), Moral philosophy: An introduction. Belmont, California: Dikenson.

Churchill, W. (1967). Homosexual behavior among males. New York: Hawthron.

D'Augelli, J. F., and Cross, H. J. Relationship of sex guilt and moral reasoning to premarital sex in college women and in couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 43, 40-47.

De Cecco, J. P. (1984). Homophobia: An Overview. New York: Haworth Press.

Embree, Robert A. (1970). The Religious Association Scale as an "abilities" measure of the religious factor in personality. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 9, 299-302.

Embree, Robert A. (1973). The Religious Association Scale: A preliminary validation study. Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion, 12, 223-226.

Embree, Robert A. (1983). The effects of religious norm and sexual orientation on judgments about sexual morality. Presented at the 26th annual meeting of The Society for the Scientific Study of Sex, Chicago, Illinois.

Embree, Robert A. (1985). Sexual Standards: A pre-course and post-course comparison. Presented at the first annual Midcontinent Region meeting of The Society for the Scientific Study of Sex, Chicago, Illinois.

Fact-file: Freshmen characteristics and attitudes: A national profile based on responses of 182,000 students who entered college in the Fall of 1984. (1985, January 16). Source: The American Freshman: National norms for Fall 1984 by A. W. Astin. American Council on Education and University of California at Los Angeles. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. 15-16.

Farina, A., Fisher, J. D., Getter, H., and Fischer, E. H. (1978). Some consequences of changing people's views regarding the nature of mental illness. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 87, 272-279.

Fromm, Erich (1950). Psychoanalysis and Religion. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Fyfe, B. (1983). "Homophobia" or homosexual bias reconsidered. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 12, 549-554.

Gibbs, J. C., and Schnell, S. V. (1985). Moral development "versus" socialization. American Psychologist, 40, 1071-1080.

Glassner, B., and Owen, C. (1976). Variations in attitudes homosexuality. Cornell Journal of Social Relations, 11, 161-176. (From Psychological Abstracts, 1977, 58, Abstract No. 9419)

Gramick, Jeannine (1982). Homosphobia: A new challenge. Social Work, 28, 137-141.

Greenberg, D. F., and Bystryn, M. H. (1982). Christian intolerance of homosexuality. Journal of Sociology, 88, 515-548.

Hansen, G. L. Measuring prejudice against homosexuality (homosexism) among college students: A new scale. The Journal of Social Psychology, 117, 233-236.

Haeberle, E. J. (1978). The sex atlas. New York: Seabury Press.

Hellman, R. E., Green, R., Gray, J. L., and Williams, K. (1981). Childhood sexual identity, childhood religiosity, and "homophobia" as influences in the development of trans-sexualism, homosexuality, and heterosexuality. Archives of General Psychiatry, 38, 910-915. (From Psychological Abstracts, 1981, 66, Abstract No. 12090)

Hendrick, S., and Hendrick, C. (1985) Gender differences in sexual attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1630-1642.

Hendrick, S., and Hendrick, C. (the revised scale was provided by the authors, personal communication, March 7, 1986)

Henley, N. M., and Pincus, F. (1978). Interrelationship of sexist, racist, and anti-homosexual attitudes. Psychological Reports, 42, 83-90.

Herek, G. M. (1984). Beyond "homophobia": A social psychological perspective on attitudes toward lesbians and gay men. In J. P. De Cecco (Ed.), Homophobia: An Overview. New York: Haworth Press.

Hogan, Robert. (1973). Moral conduct and moral character: A Psychological perspective. Psychological Bulletin, 79, 217-232.

Hong, Sung-mook (1983). Sex, religion and factor analytically derived attitudes towards homosexuality. Australian Journal of Sex, Marriage & Family, 4, 142-150. (From Psychological Abstracts, 1985, 72, Abstract No. 1188)

Integrity Forum (1979-80). Christian understanding of human sexiuality: Report from the Methodist Church of Great Britain, Division of Social Responsibility and Faith & Order Committee. 6(2), 1-6.

Kelley, Harold H. (1971). Moral evaluation. American Psychologist, 26, 293-300.

Kelley, H. H., and Michela, J. L. (1980). Attribution theory and research. In M. R. Rosenzweig and L. W. Porter (Eds.), Annual review of psychology. Palo Alto, California: Annual Reviews.

Krulewitz, J. E., and Nash, J.E. (1980). Effects of sex role attitudes and similarity on men's rejection of male homosexuals. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 67-74.

Larsen, K. S., Reed, M., and Hoffman, S. (1980). Attitudes of heterosexuals toward homosexuality: A Likert-Type Scale and construct validity. The Journal of Sex Research, 16, 245-257.

Leitner, L. M., and Cado, Suzana (1982). Personal constructs and homosexual stress. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43,, 869-872.

Lewis, L. A. (1984). The coming-out process for lesbians: Integrating a stable identity. Social Work, 29, 464-469.

MacDonald, Jr., A. P., Huggins, J., Young, S., and Swanson, R. (1973). Attitudes toward homosexuality: Preservation of sex morality or the double standard. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40, 161.

Marmor, J. (1972). Homosexuality: Mental illness or moral dilemma? International Journal of Psychiatry, 10, 114-117.

Martin, A. Damien (1982). Learning to hide: The socialization of the gay adolescent. Adolescent Psychiatry, 10, 52-65. (From Psychological Abstracts, 1985, 72, Abstract No. 3722)

Middleton, R., and Putney, S. (1962). Religion, normative standards and behavior. Sociometry, 25, 141-152.

Millham, J., San Miguel, C. L., and Kellogg, R. (1976). Journal of Homosexuality, 2, 3-10. (From Psychological Abstracts, 1977, 57, Abstract No. 10187)

Money, John (1980). Love and love sickness. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Money, John (1982). Sexosophy: A new concept. The Journal of Sex Research, 18, 364-366.

Mosher, Donald L., and O'Grady, Kevin E. (1979). Homosexual threat, negative attitudes toward masturbation, sex guilt, and males' sexual and affective reactions to explicit sexual films. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 47, 860-873.

Mosher, Donald L. (the revised scale was provided by the author, 1986)

Mosher, Donald L. (1986). Sexual science and public policy: What's hot and what's not. Presented at the second annual Midcontinent Region meeting of The Society for the Scientific Study of Sex, Madison, Wisconsin.

Nelson, James B. (1978). Embodiment: An approach to sexuality and Christian theology. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House.

Nevid, Jeffrey S. (1983). Exposure to homoerotic stimuli: Effects on attitudes and affects of heterosexuals. Journal of Social Psychology, 119, 249-255.

Newton, D. E. (1979). Representations of homosexuality in health science textbooks. Journal of Homosexuality, 219-235; 247-254. (From Psychological Abstracts, 1980, 64, Abstract No. 6468)

Pittel, S. M., and Mendelsohn, G. A. (1966). Measurement of moral values: A review and critique. Psychological Bulletin, 66, 22-35.

Reese, H. W., and Fremouw, W. J. (1984). Psychology, research, and social policy. American Psychologist, 39, 863-876.

Reis, Ira L. (1981). Some observations on ideology and sexuality in America. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 271-283.

Reis, Ira L. (1982). Trouble in paradise: The current status of sexual science. The Journal of Sex Research, 18, 97-113.

Robinson, D. N. (1984). Ethics and advocacy. American Psychologist, 39, 787-793.

Rotter, J. G., and Rafferty, Janet E. (1950). Manual, The Rotter Incomplete Sentences Blank, College Form. New York: Psychological Corporation.

Sadoff, Robert L. (1976). Sex and the law. In B. J. Sadock, H. I. Kaplan, & A. M. Freedman (Eds.), The Sexual Experience. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.

Schacht, T. E. (1985). DSM-III and the politics of truth. American Psychologist, 40, 513-521.

Scruton, Roger (1986). Sexual desire: A moral philosophy of the erotic. New York: The Free Press.

Simon, W., and Gagnon, J. H. (1986). Sexual scripts: Permanence and change. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 15, 97-120. Smith,

Anthony (1986). The body. New York: Viking.

Smith, K. (1971). Homophobia: A tentative personality profile. Psychological Reports, 29, 1091-1094.

Spitzer, R. L. (1985). DSM-III and the politics-science dichotomy syndrome: A response to Thomas E. Schacht's "DSM-III and the politics of truth". American Psychologist, 40, 522-526.

Starbuck, Gene H. (1981) Models of human sexuality and social control. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America.

Turnbull, D., and Brown, M. (1977). Attitudes towards homosexuality and male and female reaction to homosexual and heterosexual slides. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 1977, 9, 68-80. (From Psychological Abstracts, 1978, 58, Abstract No. 5280)

Wallace, J. (1966). An abilities conception of personality: Some implications for personality measurement. American Psychologist, 21, 132-138.

Wallace, J. (1967). What units shall we employ? Allport's question revisted. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 31, 56-64.

Weitz, R. (1982). From the closet to the classroom: Homosexuality in abnormal psychology and deviance textbooks. Deviant Behavior, 3, 385-398. (From Psychological Abstracts, 1983, 70, Abstract No. 1037)

Wolfenden Report (1964). New York: Lancer Books.

Young, M., and Whertvine, J. Attitudes of heterosexual students toward homosexual behavior. Psychological Reports, 51, 673-674.

Table 1: Explanation of Variables Used in Study One

Variables	Description
1. Treating sexual behavior between two consenting adults of the same sex as criminal, immoral, sexual deviancy, or mental illness is prejudicial, discriminatory, and unjustified victimization of a minority group.	Homosexual Cognitive Victimization
2. My religion taught me that homosexuality is a sin.	Conventional
3. I was brought up to believe sex is appropriate only in a heterosexual relationship.	Conventional
4. My religion taught me that homosexuality is natural for some persons.	Sex Freedom
5. I am intolerant when it comes to homosexuality. Homosexuals get what they deserve.	Homosexual Threat
6. The things that I read generally are critical of the homosexual life-style.	Conventional
7. My style is not to judge others. It doesn't bother me if someone has a homosexual orientation.	Homosexual Threat
8. Popular magazine articles that I read have made me more tolerant about homosexuality.	Sex Freedom
9. The Bible makes it clear that God does not approve of homosexuality.	Conventional
10. I was taught that what consenting adults do sexually is a private matter which should be of no concern to society.	Sex Freedom
11. I have read books that have convinced me that the homosexual orientation is just as natural for some people as a heterosexual orientation is for others.	Sex Freedom
12. As a sexually mature adult, I have never been attracted sexually to a person of my own sex.	Homosexual Attraction
13. RAS Religiosity (Stanine Score)	
14. Recreational Sex (Stanine Score)	

Note:- Items 2 through 11 are self-assigned causal attributions of the victimization position. Item 3 was not included in the "conventional attribution" scale.

Table 2: Intercorrelations of Items and Variables (N=78)

Variables

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	-258	-330	243	-205	121	286	292	-316	313	251	-141	-381	-184
2		650	-416	376	107	-519	-268	632	-621	-499	179	360	495
3			-319	469	215	-629	-327	530	-541	-566	246	144	536
4				-246	001	354	328	-302	338	463	-173	-133	-325
5					203	-374	-309	198	-320	-400	209	140	313
6						-006	-119	027	-054	010	034	-077	007
7							617	-392	585	674	-286	-256	-539
8								-239	356	465	-142	-301	-359
9									-556	-346	084	315	508
10										552	-295	-251	-532
11											-202	-214	-452
12												139	107
13													226

Note:-The decimals have been omitted from the correlations. See Table 1 for descriptions of the variables.

Variables	Means	Standard Deviations
1 - Homosexual Cognitive Victimization	2.94	1.30
2 - Conventional	3.35	1.36
3 - Conventional	4.01	1.18
4 - Sex Freedom	2.12	1.01
5 - Homosexual Threat	2.87	1.20
6 - Conventional	3.65	1.09
7 - Homosexual Threat	2.83	1.29
8 - Sex Freedom	2.67	1.10
9 - Conventional	3.50	1.09
10 - Sex Freedom	3.22	1.15
11 - Sex Freedom	2.78	1.22
12 - Homosexual Attraction	4.60	0.78
13 - RAS Religiosity	5.00	1.99
14 - Recreational Sex	5.00	2.00

Table 3: Principal Component for Variables and Items (N=78)

Variable	Loading	h^2
1. Treating sexual behavior between two consenting adults of the same sex as criminal, immoral, sexual deviancy, or mental illness is prejudicial, discriminatory, and unjustified victimization of a minority group.	-.438	.192
Causal Attribution Items		
2. My religion taught me that homosexuality is a sin.	.773	.597
3. I was brought up to believe sex is appropriate only in a heterosexual relationship.	.779	.606
4. My religion taught me that homosexuality is natural for some persons.	-.499	.249
5. I am intolerant when it comes to homosexuality. Homosexuals get what they deserve.	.508	.258
6. The things that I read generally are critical of the homosexual life-style.	.099	.009
7. My style is not to judge others. It doesn't bother me if someone has a homosexual orientation.	-.792	.628
8. Popular magazine articles that I read have made me more tolerant about homosexuality.	-.570	.324
9. The Bible makes it clear that God does not approve of homosexuality.	.667	.445
10. I was taught that what consenting adults do sexually is a private matter which should be of no concern to society.	-.751	.564
11. I have read books that have convinced me that the homosexual orientation is just as natural for some people as a heterosexual orientation is for others.	-.727	.528
Homosexual Arousal		
12. As a sexually mature adult, I have never been attracted sexually to a person of my own sex.	.304	.092
13. Religiosity (Stanine Score)	.394	.155
14. Recreational Sex (Stanine Score)	.668	.447
Common Factor Variance	5.096	
Variance Explained	64.5%	

Table 4: Correlations, Means and SDs (N=78)

Variables

	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	-.347	.365	-.299	-.141	-.381	-.186
2		-.654	.631	.200	.322	.597
3			-.718	-.271	-.301	-.560
4				.300	.241	.521
5					.139	.110
6						.230

Variable Description	Mean	SD
1. Homosexual Cognitive Victimization (1 item)	2.94	1.30
2. Conventional Attribution (3 items)	10.86	3.13
3. Sexual Freedom Attribution (4 items)	10.78	3.38
4. Homosexual Stress (2 items)	6.04	2.07
5. Homosexual Sexual Arousal (single item)	4.60	.78
6. RAS Religiosity (Stanine Score)	5.00	1.99
7. Recreational Sex (Stanine)	4.95	2.00

Note.-The Recreational Sex score was derived from two different ratings, one for a heterosexual relationship and one for a homosexual relationship. A low score denotes a pro-recreational sex attitude.

Table 5: Principal Component Factor Loadings (Single Factor N=78)

Variables	Loading	h^2
Homosexual Cognitive Victimization		
1. Treating sexual behavior between two consenting adults of the same sex as criminal, immoral, sexual deviancy, or mental illness is prejudicial, discriminatory, and unjustified victimization of a minority group.	-.503	.253
Causal Attribution of Victimization Position		
2. Conventional Religious Socialization	.800	.639
3. Sexual Freedom Socialization	-.841	.708
4. Homosexual Stress	.794	.630
Homosexual Sexual Arousal		
5. As a sexually mature adult, I have never been attracted sexually to a person of my own sex.	.294	.086
Religiosity		
6. RAS Religiosity	.469	.220
Sexual Morality		
7. Recreational Sex	.678	.460
Common Factor Variance	2.996	
Variance Explained	69.0%	

Table 6: Conventional Causal Attribution Scale

Causal Attribution of Your Current Viewpoint on Homosexuality

What EXPLAINS your CURRENT VIEWPOINT (not your viewpoint at some other time in your life)? Why do you take the view that you did above about victimization of homosexuals in our society?

1. Religious leaders (or some other authorities) whom I trust have convinced me that homosexuality is sinful or sick.

2. I have heard no convincing arguments to justify sex in other than the heterosexual relationship.

3. Authorities whom I trust have convinced me that homosexuality is natural for some persons. (Reversed scoring)

4. Popular magazine articles and books that I have read have convinced me that society is unjust in viewing homosexuality as a sickness or deviancy. (Reversed scoring)

5. I find the view that God condemns homosexuality to be valid and justified.

6. Even when I think about the Bible's views on homosexuality, I do not find the typical interpretations of the Bible as disapproving of homosexuality to be meaningful for contemporary society. (Reversed scoring)

Table 7: Intercorrelations of Items and Variables (N=34)

Variables

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1a	-309	487	-030	472	-335	-214	-062	-191	107	-028	111
1b	-099	220	-306	-347	210	-018	119	191	005	-082	274
1c	282	-523	055	-221	117	344	113	-037	-154	054	-468
2		-706	311	050	261	056	-031	006	-390	-054	-232
3			-384	174	-268	-204	047	008	319	-032	444
4				-159	245	151	100	-072	-184	236	-429
5					-512	-504	-286	-139	085	021	426
6						-030	023	408	-333	-372	-227
7							325	073	-085	190	-418
8								109	-150	071	-149
9									-072	-284	-172
10										221	157
11											-137

Note:-The decimals have been omitted from the correlations.

Variables	Means	SD
1a - Moral for married heterosexuals only	2.20	3.11
1b - Moral for heterosexuals only	2.67	3.10
1c - Moral for heterosexual/homosexuals	1.31	2.01
2 - Homosexual Cognitive Victimization	2.50	1.33
3 - Causal Attribution: Conventional	3.45	0.94
4 - Homosexual Arousal	1.32	0.91
5 - Mosher Sex-Guilt	2.26	0.87
6 - Hendrick & Hendrick Permissiveness	2.24	0.75
7 - Hendrick & Hendrick Sexual Practices	4.11	0.53
8 - Hendrick & Hendrick Communion	3.89	0.51
9 - Hendrick & Hendrick Instrumentality	2.52	0.91
10 - Mosher Guilty-Conscience	3.42	0.56
11 - Mosher Hostility-Guilt	3.40	0.62
12 - RAS Authoritarian Types (82.4 percent authoritarian)		

Note:-The decimals have been omitted from the correlations.
See the text for scale score interpretations.

Table 8: Varimax Simple Structure Factor Loadings (N=34)

Variable	Factors I	II	III	h^2
1a - Moral for married heterosexuals only	.374	-.346	.343	.378
2 - Homosexual Cognitive Victimization	-.822	-.123	-.080	.697
3 - Causal Attribution: Conventional	.875	-.129	.039	.784
4 - Homosexual Arousal	-.504	.253	.164	.345
5 - Mosher Sex-Guilt	.067	-.780	.362	.743
6 - Hendrick & Hendrick Peraissiveness	-.309	.185	-.726	.656
7 - Hendrick & Hendrick Sexual Practices	-.114	.696	.099	.508
8 - Hendrick & Hendrick Communion	.061	.454	-.027	.210
9 - Hendrick & Hendrick Instrumentality	.038	.142	-.523	.295
10 - Mosher Guilty-Conscience	.442	.011	.294	.282
11 - Mosher Hostilitiy-Guilt	-.060	.208	.680	.550
12 - RAS Authoritarian Religion Type	.407	-.526	-.011	.443
Common Factor Variance	2.319	1.929	1.644	
Percent of Variance Explained	29.2	24.3	20.7	

Table 9: Oblique Simple Structure Factor Loadings (N=34)

Variable	Factors I	II	III
1a - Moral for married heterosexuals only	.471	-.113	.102
2 - Homosexual Cognitive Victimization	-.812	-.199	.016
3 - Causal Attribution: Conventional	.811	.003	-.083
4 - Homosexual Arousal	-.515	.126	.159
5 - Mosher Sex-Guilt	-.046	-.717	.201
6 - Hendrick & Hendrick Permissiveness	-.227	.073	-.704
7 - Hendrick & Hendrick Sexual Practices	.021	.766	.163
8 - Hendrick & Hendrick Communion	.134	.626	.029
9 - Hendrick & Hendrick Instrumentality	.143	.111	-.743
10 - Mosher Guilty-Conscience	.527	.038	.156
11 - Mosher Hostilitiy-Guilt	-.106	.189	.761
12 - RAS Authoritarian Religion Type	.184	-.595	-.010

Factor Intercorrelations:

I vs. II	.319
I vs. III	-.188
II vs. III	.068

Table 10: Varimax Simple Structure Factor Loadings (N=34)

Variable	Factors I	II	III	h^2
1b - Moral for heterosexuals only	-.393	.491	.141	.414
2 - Homosexual Cognitive Victimization	.776	.114	-.123	.631
3 - Causal Attribution: Conventional	-.806	-.020	-.109	.663
4 - Homosexual Arousal	.548	-.161	.258	.393
5 - Mosher Sex-Guilt	-.040	-.383	-.758	.723
6 - Hendrick & Hendrick Permissiveness	.337	.745	.169	.697
7 - Hendrick & Hendrick Sexual Practices	.120	-.100	.699	.513
8 - Hendrick & Hendrick Communion	-.059	.063	.472	.231
9 - Hendrick & Hendrick Instrumentality	-.010	.520	.134	.289
10 - Mosher Guilty-Conscience	-.468	-.330	.002	.328
11 - Mosher Hostilitiy-Guilt	-.009	-.597	.276	.433
12 - RAS Authoritarian Religion Type	-.513	.061	-.574	.596
Common Factor Variance	2.323	1.736	1.852	
Percent of Variance Explained	29.4	22.0	23.4	

Table 11: Oblique Simple Structure Factor Loadings (N=34)

Variable	Factors I	II	III
1b - Moral for heterosexuals only	-.256	.560	.055
2 - Homosexual Cognitive Victimization	.832	.053	-.164
3 - Causal Attribution: Conventional	-.779	.053	-.054
4 - Homosexual Arousal	.589	-.193	.145
5 - Mosher Sex-Guilt	.096	-.288	-.728
6 - Hendrick & Hendrick Permissiveness	.301	.712	.070
7 - Hendrick & Hendrick Sexual Practices	-.041	-.164	.782
8 - Hendrick & Hendrick Communion	-.112	-.009	.618
9 - Hendrick & Hendrick Instrumentality	-.068	.693	.093
10 - Mosher Guilty-Conscience	-.619	-.197	.035
11 - Mosher Hostility-Guilt	-.021	-.675	.219
12 - RAS Authoritarian Religion Type	-.254	.102	-.609

Factor Intercorrelations:

I vs. II	-.027
I vs. III	-.274
II vs. III	-.122

Table 12: Varimax Simple Structure Factor Loadings (N=34)

Variable	Factors I	II	III	h^2
1c - Moral for heterosexuals/homosexuals	.507	.062	.368	.397
2 - Homosexual Cognitive Victimization	.793	-.118	-.168	.672
3 - Causal Attribution: Conventional	-.871	.045	-.086	.768
4 - Homosexual Arousal	.554	.100	.217	.364
5 - Mosher Sex-Guilt	-.067	.321	-.733	.645
6 - Hendrick & Hendrick Permissiveness	.283	-.779	.183	.720
7 - Hendrick & Hendrick Sexual Practices	.144	.117	.729	.566
8 - Hendrick & Hendrick Communion	-.030	-.032	.420	.178
9 - Hendrick & Hendrick Instrumentality	-.064	-.523	.159	.303
10 - Mosher Guilty-Conscience	-.401	.311	-.008	.257
11 - Mosher Hostility-Guilt	.067	.696	.235	.544
12 - RAS Authoritarian Religion Type	-.465	.032	-.559	.530
Common Factor Variance	2.443	1.609	1.891	
Percent of Variance Explained	30.8	20.3	23.9	

Table 13: Oblique Simple Structure Factor Loadings (N=34)

Variable	Factors I	II	III
1c - Moral for heterosexuals/homosexuals	.488	.092	.212
2 - Homosexual Cognitive Victimization	.805	-.045	-.223
3 - Causal Attribution: Conventional	-.814	-.022	.033
4 - Homosexual Arousal	.506	.120	.109
5 - Mosher Sex-Guilt	.132	.214	-.740
6 - Hendrick & Hendrick Permissiveness	.200	-.733	.075
7 - Hendrick & Hendrick Sexual Practices	-.014	.162	.756
8 - Hendrick & Hendrick Communion	-.138	.035	.626
9 - Hendrick & Hendrick Instrumentality	-.163	-.745	.124
10 - Mosher Guilty-Conscience	-.552	.196	.065
11 - Mosher Hostility-Guilt	.053	.755	.199
12 - RAS Authoritarian Religion Type	-.278	-.002	-.550

Factor Intercorrelations:

I vs. II	.113
I vs. III	-.352
II vs. III	.086

Table 14: RAS Correlations with Variables (N=34)

Variable	RAS Correlations A	B
1 - Acceptable only for married heterosexuals Mean=2.20 Standard Deviation=3.11	.067	.111
2 - Acceptable for all heterosexuals but not for homosexuals Mean=2.67 Standard Deviation=3.10	.244	.274
3 - Acceptable for heterosexuals and homosexuals Mean=1.31 Standard Deviation=2.01	-.259	-.468*
4 - Acceptable for homosexuals only Mean=0.00 Standard Deviation=0.00	.000	.000
5 - Not acceptable for heterosexuals nor homosexuals Mean=0.40 Standard Deviation=1.35	.041	.138
6 - Not a moral issue in any relationship Mean=0.88 Standard Deviation=1.94	-.359*	-.271
7 - Undecided Mean=0.22 Standard Deviation=0.41	-.027	-.221
8 - Homosexual Cognitive Victimization	-.258	-.232
9 - Causal Attribution: Conventional	.251	.444*
10 - Homosexual Arousal	-.260	-.429*
11 - Mosher Sex-Guilt	.184	.426*
12 - Mosher Guilty-Conscience	.068	.157
13 - Mosher Hostility-Guilt	.073	-.137
14 - Hendrick & Hendrick Permissiveness	-.410*	-.227
15 - Hendrick & Hendrick Sexual Practices	-.064	-.418*
16 - Hendrick & Hendrick Communion	-.057	-.149
17 - Hendrick & Hendrick Instrumentality	-.288	-.172
18 - (A) RAS Authoritarin Religion (Normative Scale)	---	.557*
19 - (B) RAS Authoritarian Type (Point-biserial)	.557*	---

*Statistically significant at the 5% level or less.